

**REMARKS**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Interview held on October 18, 2005.

Claims 1-2, 4-16, and 18-20 are pending. By this amendment, claims 1, 15, 16, and 18-20 are amended. Claim 1 has been amended to correct an informality. Claims 15-16 and 18-20 have been amended to recite computer readable program code, according to the Examiner's suggestions. No new matter is introduced. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Entry of the above amendments is proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 because the amendments (1) place the claims in better form for appeal if needed; and (2) do not introduce any elements requiring further search by the Examiner.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §101**

Claims 1-2, 4-8, 15-16, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claims 1, 15-16, and 18-20 have been amended according to the Examiner's suggestions. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 because of an informality. Claim 1 has been amended to correct the informality. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1-2, 4-16, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) over U.S. Patent 6,604,108 to Nitahara (hereafter Nitahara) in view of U.S. Patent 6,681,227 to Kojima et al. (hereafter Kojima) and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,189,011 to Lim et al. (hereafter Lim). The Office Action acknowledges on page 7 that the combination of Kojima and Nitahara fails to disclose the feature of enabling the user to update the data through the conduits ... without having to update each data source individually. However, the Office Action asserts that Lim "discloses a central database and a plurality of replicated database, where the update is performed in the central database and the modified information is distributed to other database. Therefore, the user does not have to update individual database. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Lim into the combination of Kojima and Nitahara because the teaching would reduce the time processing information." This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Nitahara is directed to an information mart system and information mart browser. The information mart system collects financial and testing data in the context of drug testing by pharmaceutical companies. Kojima is directed to a system and method for retrieving data from a database system. Lim is directed to a method of maintaining a network of partially replicated database system. As noted in the Office Action, Lim merely updates a database by updating data in a central database and distributing the modified information to other databases. Lim does not enable a user to update data from multiple data sources, and certainly does not enable a user to update data from multiple data sources through conduits using a user interface without having to update each data source individually. Therefore, Nitahara, Kojima, and Lim, individually and in combination, do not disclose or suggest “enabling a user to update the data from the multiple data sources through the conduits using a user interface without having to update each data source individually,” as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added). Since the cited references do not disclose or suggest all of the elements of claim 1, claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2 and 4-8 are allowable because they depend from allowable claim 1 and for the additional features they recite. For example, Nitahara, Kojima, and Lim, individually and in combination, do not disclose or suggest “wherein the updating step includes striping the source identifier from the data before updating the data context,” as recited in claim 5 (emphasis added). Similarly, Nitahara, Kojima, and Lim, individually and in combination, do not disclose or suggest “wherein the updating step includes updating automatically elements that depend on views against the database tables in the display context,” as recited in claim 6 (emphasis added). Likewise, Nitahara, Kojima, and Lim, individually and in combination, do not disclose or suggest “wherein the updating step includes updating explicitly elements that do not depend on views against the database tables in the display context,” as recited in claim 7 (emphasis added). Applicant respectfully contends that these claim features are not addressed in the Office Action.

Regarding claim 9, for at least the same reason as stated above with respect to claim 1, Nitahara, Kojima, and Lim, individually and in combination, do not disclose or suggest “wherein the conduits enable a user to user to update the data from the multiple data sources through the conduits using a user interface without having to update each data source individually,” as recited in claim 9 (emphasis added). Since the cited references do not disclose or suggest all of the elements of claim 9, claim 9 is allowable.

Appl. No. 09/981,893  
Amdt. dated November 14, 2005  
Reply to Final Office Action of September 13, 2005

Claims 10-14 are allowable because they depend from allowable claim 9 and for the additional features they recite.

Regarding claim 15, for at least the same reason as stated above with respect to claim 1, Nitahara, Kojima, and Lim, individually and in combination, do not disclose or suggest “enabling a user to update the data from the multiple data sources through the conduits using a user interface without having to update each data source individually,” as recited in claim 15 (emphasis added). Since the cited references do not disclose or suggest all of the elements of claim 15, claim 15 is allowable.

Claims 16 and 18-20 are allowable because they depend from allowable claim 15 and for the additional features they recite.

Withdrawal of rejections of claims 1-2, 4-16, and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Prompt examination and allowance are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desired in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Date: November 14, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

Sean S. Wooden

Registration No. 43,997

**Andrews Kurth LLP**

1701 Pennsylvania Ave, N.W.

Suite 300

Washington, DC 20006

Tel. (202) 662-2700

Fax (202) 662-2739